

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

RECEIVED

JUN 03 2011

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

GERALD REED

(Enter above the full name
of the plaintiff or plaintiffs in
this action)

vs.

11 C 3777

Judge James B. Zagel
Magistrate Judge Maria Valdez

MARCUS HARDY, R. PFISTER

WARDEN EDWARDS, J. BALDWIN

C. HARRIS, COLLEEN FRANKLIN

JACKIE MILLER, GLADYSE C. TAYLOR

JOAN DOE - RDA COORDINATOR

C. DOWNS, C. WRIGHT, J. ENCARNACION

(Enter above the full name of ALL
defendants in this action. Do not
use "et al.")

CHECK ONE ONLY:

☒

COMPLAINT UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, TITLE 42 SECTION 1983
U.S. Code (state, county, or municipal defendants)

☐

COMPLAINT UNDER THE CONSTITUTION ("BIVENS" ACTION), TITLE
28 SECTION 1331 U.S. Code (federal defendants)

☐

OTHER (cite statute, if known)

**BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS COMPLAINT, PLEASE REFER TO "INSTRUCTIONS FOR
FILING." FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY.**

I. Plaintiff(s):

- A. Name: GEARLD REED
- B. List all aliases: _____
- C. Prisoner identification number: N32920
- D. Place of present confinement: STATEVILLE CORR. CTR.
- E. Address: P.O. BOX 112 JOLIET, IL. 60434-0112

(If there is more than one plaintiff, then each plaintiff must list his or her name, aliases, I.D. number, place of confinement, and current address according to the above format on a separate sheet of paper.)

II. Defendant(s):

(In A below, place the full name of the first defendant in the first blank, his or her official position in the second blank, and his or her place of employment in the third blank. Space for two additional defendants is provided in B and C.)

- A. Defendant: MARCUS HARDY
Title: CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR - WARDEN
Place of Employment: STATEVILLE C.C.
- B. Defendant: R. PFISTER
Title: ASSISTANT WARDEN
Place of Employment: STATEVILLE C.C.
- C. Defendant: EDWARDS
Title: ASSISTANT WARDEN
Place of Employment: STATEVILLE C.C.

(If you have more than three defendants, then all additional defendants must be listed according to the above format on a separate sheet of paper.)

D. DEFENDANT: J. BALDWIN

TITLE COUNSELOR

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT: STATEVILLE C.C.

E. DEFENDANT C. HARRIS

TITLE COUNSELOR

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT: STATEVILLE C.C.

F. DEFENDANT: COLLEEN FRANKLIN

TITLE GRIEVANCE OFFICER / COUNSELOR

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT STATEVILLE C.C.

G. DEFENDANT JACKIE MILLER

TITLE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BOARD MEMBER

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT: ILLINOIS DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS

H. DEFENDANT GLADYS E. C. TAYLOR

TITLE: ACTING DIRECTOR

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT ILLINOIS DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS

I. DEFENDANT C. DOWNS

TITLE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT: STATEVILLE C.C.

J. DEFENDANT C. WRIGHT

TITLE LT.

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT STATEVILLE C.C.

K. DEFENDANT J. ENCARNACION

TITLE SGT.

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT STATEVILLE

L. DEFENDANT JOHN DOE OR JANE DOE

TITLE: ADA-DISABILITY COORDINATOR

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT STATEVILLE C. C.

III. List ALL lawsuits you (and your co-plaintiffs, if any) have filed in any state or federal court in the United States:

- A. Name of case and docket number: _____

- B. Approximate date of filing lawsuit: _____
- C. List all plaintiffs (if you had co-plaintiffs), including any aliases: _____

- D. List all defendants: _____

- E. Court in which the lawsuit was filed (if federal court, name the district; if state court, name the county): _____
- F. Name of judge to whom case was assigned: _____

- G. Basic claim made: _____

- H. Disposition of this case (for example: Was the case dismissed? Was it appealed? Is it still pending?): _____

- I. Approximate date of disposition: _____

IF YOU HAVE FILED MORE THAN ONE LAWSUIT, THEN YOU MUST DESCRIBE THE ADDITIONAL LAWSUITS ON ANOTHER PIECE OF PAPER, USING THIS SAME FORMAT. REGARDLESS OF HOW MANY CASES YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY FILED, YOU WILL NOT BE EXCUSED FROM FILLING OUT THIS SECTION COMPLETELY, AND FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF YOUR CASE. CO-PLAINTIFFS MUST ALSO LIST ALL CASES THEY HAVE FILED.

IV. Statement of Claim:

State here as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant is involved, including names, dates, and places. **Do not give any legal arguments or cite any cases or statutes.** If you intend to allege a number of related claims, number and set forth each claim in a separate paragraph. (Use as much space as you need. Attach extra sheets if necessary.)

SINCE SOMETIME AROUND AUGUST 2009 PLAINTIFF HAS HAD TO USE CRUTCHES TO GET AROUND (MOVE). DURING THAT TIME PLAINTIFF HAD A PERMIT FOR HIS CRUTCHES & WAS PERMITTED TO GO TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE WITH HIS CELL HOUSE & GALLERY. SOMETIME AROUND AUGUST 2010 OR JULY 2010 PLAINTIFF WAS ON HIS WAY OUTSIDE TO GO TO HIS SCHEDULED OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD & HE WAS STOPPED BY THE CELL HOUSE OFFICER, SGT. & LT. PLAINTIFF WAS TOLD THAT BECAUSE HE HAD CRUTCHES, HE COULD NOT GO OUT WITH HIS GALLERY FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD. UP UNTIL THIS DAY PLAINTIFF HAD BEEN GOING OUT TO THE YARD WITH HIS ASSIGNED GALLERY ON HIS ASSIGNED DAYS. AT THIS TIME AUGUST 2010 THE YARD SCHEDULE WAS ON 2 DAYS A WEEK YARD WAS BAN FOR TWO & A HALF HOURS EACH DAY FOR A TOTAL OF 5 HOURS A WEEK. ALSO AT THIS TIME THE INSTITUTION WAS RUNNING NIGHT YARD FOR THE POPULATION & PROTECTIVE CUSTODY UNITS. FROM AUGUST 2010 THRU DECEMBER 2010

PLAINTIFF WAS NOT ALLOWED TO GO OUT PERIOD FOR ANY
 KIND OF OUT OF CELL EXERCISE. THIS IS A VIOLATION
 OF PLAINTIFFS 8TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO
 BE FREE FROM CRUEL & UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT & THE 14TH.
 AMENDMENT AS WELL, TO BE TREATED FAIR & EQUAL. SOMETIME
 IN DECEMBER 2010 AFTER PLAINTIFF HAD WRITTEN SEVERAL
 LETTERS TO WARDEN MARCUS HARDY, ASSISTANT WARDEN PEISTER
 & EDWARDS & ALSO MAJOR NILES LETTING THEM ALL KNOW
 THAT AS A RESULT OF NOT BEING ABLE TO EXERCISE
 INSIDE BECAUSE THERE WAS NO ROOM IN THE ONE MAN
 CELL OCCUPIED BY 2 INMATES & PLAINTIFF COULDN'T GO
 TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE BECAUSE HE WALKED AROUND
 WITH (2) CRUTCHES & PER WARDEN MARCUS HARDY INMATES
 WITH CRUTCHES COULDN'T GO TO OUTSIDE EXERCISE PERIOD.
 SOMETIME IN DECEMBER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES WERE TOLD
 THAT ON SUNDAYS WE WOULD BE GOING TO YARD. PLAINTIFF
 WAS BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BECAUSE OF HIS
 DISABILITY. EVEN THOUGH PLAINTIFF WAS BEING GIVEN ONE
 DAY A WEEK FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, UNLIKE ANY OTHER
 INMATES THAT ARE IN POPULATION, PLAINTIFF IS A PRACTICING
 CHRISTIAN & CHRISTIAN SERVICES ARE HELD ON SUNDAYS. PLAINTIFF
 MUST CHOOSE TO EITHER GO TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD
 OR GO TO CHRISTIAN SERVICES. REGULAR POPULATION GETS TO

GO TO CHRISTIAN SERVICES & THEY GO OUT TWO TIMES A WEEK. THEY DON'T HAVE TO MAKE A CHOICE AS TO WHICH RIGHT THEY WANT TO EXERCISE. DISCRIMINATION OCCURS WHEN ONE PERSON OR GROUP OF PEOPLE ARE DELIBERATELY TREATED DIFFERENT. PLAINTIFF & OTHER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES ARE DELIBERATELY TREATED DIFFERENTLY FOR THE SOLE REASON...THEY ARE DISABLED. DEFENDANTS WILL CLAIM THAT THE SEPERATING OF INMATES WITH CRUTCHES LIKE PLAINTIFF FROM GOING TO YARD WITH INMATES WITHOUT CRUTCHES IS FOR SECURITY REASONS. DEFENDANTS ~~ARE~~ ^{ARE} ARROGANT & BELIEVE THAT RULES & LAWS & RIGHTS ONLY APPLY TO INMATES & NOT FOR THEM TO FOLLOW OR ADHERE TO. PLAINTIFF ISN'T ALLOWED TO GO TO THE GYM WITH HIS GALLERY ON THEIR DAY BECAUSE HE HAS CRUTCHES. THIS ALLEGEDLY WAS DONE BECAUSE OF SECURITY REASONS BUT WHEN PLAINTIFF GOES TO CHRISTIAN SERVICES HE'S NOT ONLY ALLOWED TO GO TO SERVICE (HELD IN GYM) WITH HIS GALLERY

But with THE WHOLE CELL HOUSE ¹ HE'S ALLOWED TO GO
 WITH BOTH HIS CRUTCHES. DEFENDANTS CAN'T EXPLAIN
 WHY ITS A SECURITY RISK IF PLAINTIFF GOES OUT WITH
 HIS GALLERY TO THE YARD OR GYM, BUT ITS NOT A
 SECURITY RISK WHEN PLAINTIFF GOES TO CHRISTIAN
 SERVICES WITH HIS GALLERY ¹ THE REST OF THE CELL
 HOUSE. PLAINTIFF ALSO TAKES HIS CRUTCH WITH HIM
 TO LAW LIBRARY, DINNING ROOM, VISITOR ROOM, BARBER
 SHOP, CHRISTIAN SERVICES, HOSPITAL ¹ ALL OTHER
 MOVEMENTS EXCEPT FOR YARD. PLAINTIFF IS BEING
 TREATED LIKE HE'S IN SEGREGATION. SEG. ARE ONLY
 TAKEN TO OUTSIDE ONCE A WEEK LIKE ^{HOW} PLAINTIFF IS
 BEING DONE. PLAINTIFF WAS TOLD BY LT. JOHNSON, THAT
 IF HE LEFT HIS CRUTCHES ON THE OUTSIDE OF THE YARD
 GATE, THAT HE COULD GO TO THE YARD WITH HIS
 ASSIGNED GALLERY. PLAINTIFF NEEDS HIS CRUTCHES TO
 WALK. SO FOR THE LT. TO EVEN SUGGEST THAT PLAINTIFF

LEAVE HIS CRUTCHES OUTSIDE THE YARD GATES.
 THIS WAS HIS (LT. JOHNSON) WAY OF SAYING THAT HE
 THINKS PLAINTIFF IS FAKING HIS INJURY. THAT'S
 NOT HIS JOB TO WONDER ABOUT PLAINTIFF'S INJURY.
 WARDEN HARDY, PRISTER & EDWARDS EACH SHOULD HAVE
 KNOWN THAT DENYING PLAINTIFF HIS OUT OF CELL
 EXERCISE WAS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF PLAINTIFF'S
 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. HIS 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENTS
 WERE VIOLATED BY DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS SHOULD
 HAVE KNOWN THAT THEY WERE DISCRIMINATING
 AGAINST PLAINTIFF BY TELLING HIM THAT BECAUSE
 HE HAS CRUTCHES THAT HE CAN'T GO TO THE GYM,
 BIG ~~YARD~~ YARD OR SMALL YARD WITH HIS ASSIGNED
 GALLERY. DEFENDANTS SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THIS
 BEFORE THEY WROTE THE MEMO & ENFORCED IT.
 PLAINTIFF SPOKE WITH WARDEN PRISTER SOMETIME
 IN DEC. 2010 ABOUT WHY WERE THE INMATES

WITH CRUTCHES ~~BEING~~ BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST?
DEFENDANT ~~HAD~~ HAD NO REASONABLE ANSWER AS TO
WHY HE ^{IS} THE OTHER WARDENS TAKE PLAINTIFF YARD.
DEFENDANT PRISTER STATED INMATES WITH CRUTCHES
WERE INVOLVED IN A FEW INCIDENTS [!] THEREFORE
SECURITY ~~HAD~~ HAD TO SEPERATE HS WEEK TO WEEK
SO PLAINTIFF MISSED ~~THE~~ YARD BECAUSE HE WASN'T
ALLOWED TO GO PER WARDEN BULLETIN. PLAINTIFF
HAS BEEN ~~IN~~ IN STATEVILLE FOR OVER 10 YEARS
NOW, [!] HE CAN'T RECALL ANYTIME ~~BEING~~ DURING
THE PAST 10 YEARS THAT ANYBODY WITH CRUTCHES
HIT SOMEONE WITH HIS CRUTCH OR FOUGHT, SO
PLAINTIFF DOESN'T KNOW WHAT THE REASON IS THAT
LIT THE FIRE, CAUSING INMATES ^{WITH} ~~THE~~ CRUTCHES
TO BE TARGETED. NO ONE GOT BEAT OR HIT WITH
CRUTCHES, SO PLAINTIFF SEE'S NO REASON THAT
HE OR OTHER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES AREN'T BEING
ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE WITH HIS ASSIGNED GALLERY,

WHEN THEY GO OUTSIDE FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD. PLAINTIFF HAS A ROD IN HIS LEG THAT'S BROKEN & CAUSES HIM A LOT OF PAIN. WHEN PLAINTIFF WAS ABLE TO GO TO YARD TWICE A WEEK WITH THE REST OF HIS GALLERY, HE WAS ABLE TO WALK THE YARD & THAT HELPED STOP HIS LEG FROM HURTING SOME. ALSO PLAINTIFF WAS ABLE TO LIFT SOME WEIGHTS WHILE ON THE SOUTH YARD, & WHEN HE WENT TO GYM HE WAS ABLE TO USE THE WEIGHT MACHINE & DO SOME LIGHT LEG EXERCISE'S. PLAINTIFF HAS NOT BEEN ALLOWED ON THE SOUTH YARD & THEREFORE DENIED ACCESS TO THE WEIGHTS.

PLAINTIFF HAS ALSO NOT BEEN ALLOWED IN THE GYM EITHER & DENIED ACCESS TO THE WEIGHT MACHINE & THE LEG PRESS EXERCISE'S THAT HE WAS DOING WHEN HE COULD GO TO THERE. PLAINTIFF USED THESE EXERCISE'S TO HELP STRENGTHEN UP THE MUSCLES IN HIS LEG, BECAUSE OF THEM BEING WEAKEND DUE TO HIS LIMITED MOBILITY. PLAINTIFF IS AN INMATE THAT'S NOT CONFINED TO SEGREGATION. HE'S IN REGULAR POPULATION & POPULATION

INMATES ARE GIVEN OUT OF CELL EXERCISE TWO (2)
 TIMES A WEEK $\frac{1}{2}$ THEY ROTATE BETWEEN THE THREE (3)
 DIFFERENT YARDS $\frac{1}{2}$ GYM. THEY GO TO SMALL YARD (2)
 TWO TIMES $\frac{1}{2}$ THEN (1) TIME FOR THE SOUTH YARD WHERE
 THERE ARE WEIGHTS LOCATED AT, WHICH PLAINTIFF WOULD
 BENEFIT CONSIDERABLY FROM BEING ABLE TO WORK OUT WITH.
 LASTLY, POPULATION IS GIVEN (1) TIME TO GO TO THE
 GYM WHERE THE EXERCISE MACHINE IS LOCATED AT
 THAT PLAINTIFF CAN USE TO STRENGTHEN HIS LEGS, PLAINTIFF
 WANTS TO GO TO THE OTHER YARD PERIODS THAT HE'S BEEN
 DENIED BECAUSE HE HAS CRUTCHES. INSTEAD OF BEING
 GIVEN (2) TWO 2 1/2 HOUR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIODS
 LIKE EVERYONE ELSE IN POPULATION RECEIVES, PLAINTIFF IS
 ONLY BEING GIVEN ONE DAY FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE,
 $\frac{1}{2}$ HE'S BEING GIVEN 5 STRAIGHT HOURS ONLY ON THE SMALL
 YARD $\frac{1}{2}$ ONLY ON SUNDAYS. 5 HOURS IS TOO LONG FOR PLAINTIFF
 TO BE ON THE SMALL YARD OR ANY YARD FOR THAT
 MATTER. PLAINTIFF CAN'T SIT OR WALK FOR THAT LONG A
 PERIOD OF TIME, BECAUSE HIS LEG WILL START TO

HURT REALLY BAD. PLAINTIFF WENT OUT SEVERAL TIMES TO THE OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD. EACH TIME HE STAYED ON THE YARD 5 HOURS OR LONGER. EACH TIME HE CAME BACK FROM EXERCISE PERIOD PLAINTIFF'S LEG HURTS HIM SO BAD THAT TWICE HE WAS BROUGHT TO TEARS FROM THE PAIN. 5 HOURS IS TOO LONG FOR PLAINTIFF TO BE ON THE OUTSIDE EXERCISE YARD BECAUSE NOT ONLY DOES PLAINTIFF HAVE A BROKEN ROD IN HIS LEG BUT HE WAS BORN WITH A SMALL HOLE IN HIS HEART. THERE'S NO WATER FOUNTAIN OR ACCESS TO WATER ON THE SMALL YARD. PLAINTIFF TAKE A BOTTLE OF WATER WITH HIM TO THE EXERCISE PERIOD, BUT AFTER A COUPLE HOURS HIS WATER IS GONE. PLAINTIFF SUFFERED DRAMATICALLY THE NEXT COUPLE OF HOURS HE WAS FORCED TO STAY OUT ON THE YARD WITHOUT ANY MORE WATER TO DRINK. PLAINTIFF SHOULDN'T BE FORCED TO STAY ON THE YARD MORE TIME THAN HE'S ABLE TO OR USE TO BEING ON THE YARD. IF DEFENDANTS (ADMINISTRATION) WOULD

STOP DISCRIMINATING AGAINST PLAINTIFF & ALLOW HIM
TO GO BACK TO GOING TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE
PERIODS ~~ONCE~~ TWICE A WEEK WITH HIS CELL HOUSE
& GALLERY LIKE EVERY OTHER POPULATION STATUS INMATE
GETS TO DO. ITS OBVIOUS THAT PLAINTIFF IS BEING
DISCRIMINATED AGAINST. THE PROOF IS THAT WITHOUT
THE CRUTCHES THAT PLAINTIFF SO NEEDS TO MOVE
AROUND WITH HE WOULD BE ALLOWED TO GO TO YARD TWICE
LIKE HE'S ENTITLED TO DO. IF DEFENDANTS DECIDE THAT
PLAINTIFF GOING TO EXERCISE PERIOD WITH CELL HOUSE
& GALLERY LIKE THE REST OF POPULATION STATUS
INMATES IS A SECURITY RISK. DEFENDANTS CAN'T JUST
TAKE PLAINTIFFS OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD
BECAUSE THEY FEEL LIKE IT. PLAINTIFF'S EXERCISE
PERIOD IS PROTECTED BY THE 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENTS.
DEFENDANTS MUST MAKE AVAILABLE TO HE THE SAME
NUMBER OF EXERCISE PERIODS THAT THEY'VE DENIED HE
& IF THEY FAIL TO DO THAT, THEN THAT IS
DISCRIMINATION ON DEFENDANTS PART TOWARDS PLAINTIFF,
FOR NOT GIVING HIM EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE

14TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, & SUBJECTING PLAINTIFF TO CRUEL & UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT BY TAKING ONE OF HIS OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIODS & LEAVING HIM ON THE YARD OVER 5 HOURS IN THE FREEZING COLD TEMPERATURES ON DECEMBER 19TH, 2010.

DEFENDANTS TRIED TO DISCOURAGE PLAINTIFF'S BY NOT FOLLOWING THEIR OWN RULES WHEN IT COMES TO SOMEONE FILING A DISCRIMINATION GRIEVANCE. SECTION 504.830: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES, IN THE INMATE ORIENTATION MANUAL STATES: THE GRIEVANCE OFFICER SHALL PROMPTLY SUBMIT A COPY OF "ANY GRIEVANCE" ALLEGING DISCRIMINATION BASED ON DISABILITY OR A REQUEST FOR AN ACCOMMODATION BASED UPON DISABILITY TO THE FACILITY ADA COORDINATOR. THE FACILITY COORDINATOR SHALL CONDUCT SUCH INVESTIGATION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE & MAKE WRITTEN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER FOR RESOLUTION OF THE GRIEVANCE. PLAINTIFF'S GRIEVANCES WERE CONCERNING HOW HE WAS BEING

DENIED HIS YARD^{it} WAS TAKEN FROM HIM BECAUSE HE WALKED WITH CRUTCHES. AS A RESULT OF GOING OUT TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD FOR 5 HOURS OR LONGER, PLAINTIFF'S LEGS & HIP WERE HURTING HIM REALLY BAD, & AS A DIRECT RESULT OF HAVING HIS EXERCISE PERIOD TAKEN ALL TOGETHER PLAINTIFF'S JOINT & LEGS GOT REALLY STIFF & THEY ALONG WITH HIS HIP WOULD HURT SO MUCH WHEN HE MOVED, THAT IT BROUGHT TEARS TO PLAINTIFF'S EYES. DEFENDANTS DELIBERATELY DENIED ME & MY GRIEVANCE THE PROPER PROCEDURE THAT IT & WE WERE BY THE RULES, SUPPOSE TO HAVE RECEIVED. PLAINTIFF'S GRIEVANCE WASN'T SENT TO THE ADA COORDINATOR SO IT WASN'T HANDLED AS PROCEDURE STATES IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN & THAT IS A 14TH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS VIOLATION OF MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR & ~~THOROUGH~~ THOROUGH INQUIRY INTO HIS COMPLAINT & GRIEVANCE ABOUT BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BY THE LISTED DEFENDANTS BECAUSE OF HIS DISABILITY. PLAINTIFF HAS SHOWN THAT DEFENDANTS

DISCRIMINATED AGAINST HIM BECAUSE OF HIS OBVIOUS DISABILITY. PLAINTIFF HAS SHOWN HOW HE WAS HARMED & HAD TO SUFFER IN PAIN AS A DIRECT RESULT OF DEFENDANTS DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS HIM, THAT CAUSE PLAINTIFF TO BE STUCK IN EARLY 20° DEGREE WEATHER FOR OVER 5 HOURS & PLAINTIFF WASN'T PREPARED TO BE ON THAT COLD-FREEZING OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD FOR THAT LONG A TIME FRAME. PLAINTIFF WAS HARMED WHEN FROM JULY OR AUGUST 2010 HE WASN'T ALLOWED TO GO TO ANY OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIODS WHAT SO EVER BECAUSE DEFENDANTS DENIED PLAINTIFF EXERCISE FROM JULY OR AUGUST UNTIL LATE OCTOBER 2010 & AS A RESULT PLAINTIFF COULD NOT DO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE NOR INSIDE THE CELL EXERCISES & HIS LEG & HIP GOT STIFF & HURT EVERY TIME HE ROLLED OVER ON HIS SIDE & WHEN HE SAT TO LONG, OR STOOD TO LONG. THE ROD HAD BROKEN THAT WAS IN PLAINTIFF'S LEG. WHEN HE USE TO BE ABLE TO GO TO GYM & SOUTH YARD PLAINTIFF WAS ABLE TO WORKOUT ON A CONSISTANT BASIS & THIS HELPED PLAINTIFF'S LEG.

I Hip stay ~~there~~ Loosend up I Plaintiff wasn't in
 constant pain then, like he is now today from the
 lack there of, of going out to ~~out of~~ out of cell exercise
 period. Defendants violated Plaintiff's 1st Amendment
 right to use the grievance procedure to get a
 resolution to his problems of being discriminated
 against for his disability. Plaintiff asks this
 honorable court to help him find a solution to
 his on going problem of being discriminated
 against for his disability that requires him to
 walk with crutches. C-O C. Downs, Sgt. Joe Encarnacion
 I Lt. C. Wright wouldn't let Plaintiff out for yard/
 out of cell exercise period. When Plaintiff asked to
 see a copy of the memo that said he couldn't go to
 exercise period with his crutches. Neither defendant
 showed Plaintiff the memo. When Plaintiff finally saw
 the memo it said September 2010 is when the memo
 allegedly went into effect, but in July or August 2010
 is when defendants started denying Plaintiff his
 out of cell exercise. J. Baldwin, C. Harris, Colleen

FRANKLIN TREATED PLAINTIFF'S GRIEVANCES LIKE THEY WERE REGULAR GRIEVANCES WHEN THEY WERE CLEARLY MARKED DISABILITY GRIEVANCES. PLAINTIFF SENT A LETTER WITH HIS GRIEVANCES TO THE GRIEVANCES OFFICER INFORMING THEM THAT I WAS SENDING A DISABILITY GRIEVANCE TO THE GRIEVANCE OFC & PLAINTIFF ALSO SENT LETTERS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BOARD NOTIFYING THEM THAT THE COUNSELORS & GRIEVANCE OFFICER DID NOT FOLLOW PROCEDURE WITH PLAINTIFF'S DISABILITY GRIEVANCES. EVEN WITH PLAINTIFF'S LETTERS SENT TO A.R.B. & TO ACTING DIRECTOR GLADYSE C. TAYLOR, HIS GRIEVANCES WERE ANSWERED AS REGULAR GRIEVANCES & NOT DISABILITY GRIEVANCES LIKE THE RULE BOOK SAYS THEY WERE SUPPOSE TO BE ANSWERED. PLAINTIFF WROTE THE ADA COORDINATOR TWICE ASKING FOR HELP IN TRY TO GET HIS DISABILITY GRIEVANCES ANSWERED. NEITHER DEFENDANT DID THEIR JOB WHEN PLAINTIFF SENT THEM HIS GRIEVANCE & A LETTER TELLING THEM THAT PLAINTIFF'S GRIEVANCE WAS A DISABILITY GRIEVANCE & NEEDED TO BE ADDRESSED AS ONE, DEFENDANTS DELIBERATELY CHOOSE NOT TO ANSWER PLAINTIFF'S LETTERS OR HIS DISABILITY GRIEVANCE.

AS A DIRECT RESULT OF DEFENDANTS NOT FOLLOWING THEIR
 OWN RULES PLAINTIFF WAS SUBJECTED TO VIOLATIONS OF HIS
 8TH & 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. PLAINTIFF WAS DENIED A
 HEARING WITH THE AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT ADMINISTRATOR
 ON THE GROUNDS THAT HE'S BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST
 & BEING DENIED HIS OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD
 LIKE HOW EVERYONE ELSE IN POPULATION IS RECEIVING
 THEIRS. PLAINTIFF'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS
 & EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW, BECAUSE NOT
 ONLY WAS PLAINTIFF DISABILITY GRIEVANCE NOT
 PROPERLY PROCESSED BUT PLAINTIFF & EVERY OTHER
 INMATE WHO'S DISABILITY REQUIRES THEM TO USE
 CRUTCHES, FIND THEMSELVES BEING TREATED LIKE
 NO OTHER CLASS OF MEN IN STATEVILLE. PLAINTIFF
 HAS SHOWN THRUOUT THIS 1983 COMPLAINT HOW
 EACH DEFENDANT DENIED & OR VIOLATED HIS
 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, IN A DELIBERATE

INTENTIONAL FASHION. PLAINTIFF NOTIFIED DEFENDANTS
 TO THE FACT THAT HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WERE BEING
 VIOLATED BY HIM HAVING TO CHOOSE BETWEEN OUT OF CELL
 EXERCISE & GOING TO HIS CHRISTIAN WORSHIP SERVICE.
 INSTEAD OF TWO (2) DAYS OF OUT OF CELL EXERCISE LIKE HE
 HAD BEEN RECEIVING, PLAINTIFF WAS ONLY BEING ALLOWED
 ONE DAY OUT FOR EXERCISE BECAUSE HE HAD A DISABILITY
 THAT REQUIRED THAT HE USE CRUTCHES TO MOVE
 & WALK. PLAINTIFF WROTE LETTERS & GRIEVANCES IN AN
 EFFORT TO NOTIFY DEFENDANTS TO THE FACT THAT
 THEY ~~WERE~~ ^{WERE} BEING DELIBERATELY HARMFUL TO HIM
 BY TAKING HIS OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD FOR NO
 REASON OTHER... JUST BECAUSE THEY COULDN'T. PLAINTIFF
 ASKS THIS COURT TO LOOK AT HIS COMPLAINT & SEE HOW
 THE DEFENDANTS CONTINUANCELY DEPRIVED HIM OF HIS
 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BY GOING AGAINST ILLINOIS
 COMPILED STATUTE THAT STATES: FACILITIES SHALL PROVIDE
 FOR EVERY PERSON TO LEAVE HIS CELL FOR AT LEAST ONE HOUR
 A DAY. PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO HAVE THE SAME

~~Q~~ AMOUNT OF OUT OF CELL EXERCISE TIME THAT EVERYONE ELSE WHO'S NOT IN SEGREGATION IS ENTITLED TO. IF PLAINTIFF IS NOT GONNA ^{GET} WHAT THE REST OF POPULATION RECEIVES $\frac{1}{2}$ HE'S IN POPULATION ALSO, THEN PLAINTIFF IS BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BECAUSE OF HIS DISABILITY. PLAINTIFF HAS SHOWN HOW EACH DEFENDANT PLAYED A PART IN DENYING HIM HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS...

V. Relief:

State briefly exactly what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments. Cite no cases or statutes.

PLAINTIFF ASKS FOR \$250,000 IN DAMAGES, \$250,000
PAIN & SUFFERING, NOMINAL & PUNITIVE DAMAGES, TO BE
OUT MY CELL ONE HOUR A DAY & ON TOP OF ANY AWARD
PLAINTIFF WANTS A \$50.00 FILING FEE.

VI. The plaintiff demands that the case be tried by a jury. ☒ YES ☐ NO

CERTIFICATION

By signing this Complaint, I certify that the facts stated in this Complaint are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that if this certification is not correct, I may be subject to sanctions by the Court.

Signed this _____ day of _____, 20 11

(Signature of plaintiff or plaintiffs)

GERALD REED
(Print name)

#N32920
(I.D. Number)

STATEVILLE CORR. CTR.

P.O. BOX 112

JOLIET, IL 60434-0112
(Address)

WARDEN HARDY

8/25/10

I AM WRITING TO YOU, BECAUSE I'VE BEEN TOLD BY THE CELL-HOUSE OFFICERS, SGT. AND N. WRIGHT THAT I CAN'T GO TO OUTSIDE EXERCISE PERIODS, BECAUSE MY DISABILITY HAS ME USING CRUTCHES TO GET AROUND.

I AM ENTITLED TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, BECAUSE I CAN'T DO IT IN THE CELL, BY MY NOT BEING ALLOWED OUT FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE MY HIP, BACK & LEGS HAVE BEGUN TO HURT AND I KEEP CATCHING CRAMPS IN THOSE AREAS. I'M FORCED TO BE IN THE BED ALL DAY AND THERE'S ONLY ENOUGH ROOM FOR ONE OF US ON THE FLOOR AT A TIME. MY WARD BEING TAKEN, BECAUSE I HAVE A DISABILITY THAT FORCES ME TO HAVE CRUTCHES ISN'T FAIR. THIS IS A DIRECT AND DELIBERATE VIOLATION OF MY 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, I AM, SENDING THIS LETTER TO WARDEN HARDY, ASST. WARDEN PETER AND WARDEN EDWARDS. SO THAT YOU WILL KNOW THAT AS A RESULT OF YOUR NEW RULE TO NOT ALLOW ME A DISABLED INMATE WHO NEEDS CRUTCHES TO MOVE AROUND, MY OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD, LIKE YOU LET EVERY OTHER INMATE IN THIS INSTITUTION IS NOT ONLY AN 8TH & 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VIOLATION, BUT PREJUDICIAL TO INMATES WITH DISABILITIES. I ASK YOU TO PLEASE ALLOW ME TO GO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD WITH MY WALK AND GALLERY. IT WILL HELP ME TO GET WORKING AND

STRONGER, SO IN TIME I WON'T NEED CRUTCHES
BUT BY YOU TAKING MY HARD TIME, I'M ONLY GET
WEAKER AND NEED MY CRUTCH EVEN MORE SO NOW.

I PRAY YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THIS RULE OF
NO HARD FOR CRUTCHES..

C.C. WARREN HARDY

SINCERELY MR. GERALD REED

ASST. WARDEN PFISTER

8/25/10

I AM WRITING TO YOU, BECAUSE I'VE BEEN TOLD BY THE CELL-HOUSE OFFICERS, SGT. AND LT. WRIGHT ON THE 2 TO 3 SHIFT, THAT I CAN'T GO TO OUTSIDE EXERCISE PERIOD, BECAUSE MY DISABILITY HAS ME USING CRUTCHES TO GET AROUND. I AM ENTITLED TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, BECAUSE I CAN'T DO IT IN THE CELL. BY MY NOT BEING ALLOWED OUT FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE MY HIP, BACK AND LEGS HAVE BEEN HURTING AND I GET CRAMPS ALOT IN THOSE AREAS OF MY LEG.

I'M FORCED TO BE IN THE DEN MOST OF THE DAY. AND THERE'S ONLY ENOUGH ROOM IN THIS LITTLE CELL, FOR ONE PERSON AT A TIME ON THE FLOOR AT A TIME. MY YARD BEING TAKEN. BECAUSE I HAVE A DISABILITY THAT FORCES ME TO HAVE CRUTCHES IS FAIR TO ME, OR ANYONE WITH A CRUTCH IN THIS SITUATION. THIS IS A DIRECT AND DELIBERATE VIOLATION OF MY 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT. I AM SENDING THIS LETTER TO WARDEN PFISTER, HARDY AND EDWARDS SO THAT YOU WILL KNOW THAT AS A RESULT OF YOUR NEW RULE TO NOT ALLOW ME A DISABLED INMATE, WHO NEED A CRUTCH TO TRAVEL AROUND, MY OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD LIKE ALL THE OTHER INMATE IN THE INSTITUTION IS NOT ONLY A VIOLATION OF MY 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENT, BUT THIS PROCESS VIOLATES AND PREJUDICE TOWARDS INMATES WITH DISABILITY

I ASK YOU AND YOUR AUTHORITY STAFF, TO PLEASE, I MEAN PLEASE ALLOW ME TO GO OUT TO THE OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIODS WITH MY WALK AND GALLERY. IT WILL HELP ME TO GET HEALTHIER AND STRENGTHEN MY LEG. SO IN TIME I WON'T NEED CRUTCHES, BUT BY YOU TAKING MY YARD TIME, I'LL ONLY GET WEAKER AND NEED THIS CRUTCH EVEN LONGER THAN I HAVE TO. I PRAY YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THIS RULE OF NO YARD FOR CRUTCHES.

MR. GERARD REED

TO: C.C. WARDEN PETER

WARDEN EDWARDS

8/25/10

I AM WRITING TO YOU, BECAUSE I'VE BEEN TOLD BY THE CELLHOUSE OFFICERS, SGT. AND LT. WRIGHT THAT I CAN'T GO TO THE OUTSIDE EXERCISE PERIOD, DUE TO MY DISABILITY, WITH HAVING A CRUTCH TO GET AROUND, FROM PLACE TO PLACE.

IF NOT ALLOWED OUT FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, MY NECK, BACK AND LEG, HAVE BEEN HURTING. AND THE PAIN IN IT IS UNBEARABLE, BY CATCHING CRAMPS IN THOSE AREA. HAVE ME UNABLE TO LEAVE THE CELL, JUST TO WAIT TO THE CHOW HALL. SO THAT FORCES ME TO BE IN BED MOST OF THE DAYS, I CAN'T EXERCISE IN THE CELL. BECAUSE MY CELL-MATE IS ON THE FLOOR ALL DAY AND THERE'S ONLY ENOUGH ROOM FOR ONE OF US TO BE ON THE FLOOR AT A TIME.

MY YARD BEING TAKEN, BECAUSE I HAVE A DISABILITY THAT FORCES ME TO HAVE CRUTCHES ISN'T FAIR. THIS IS A DIRECT AND DELIBERATE VIOLATION OF MY 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT. I AM SEND THIS LETTER TO YOU WARDEN MR. EDWARDS, ALONG WITH A LETTER TO WARDEN WARD AND WRIGHT ABOUT THIS MATTER. SO THAT YOU ALL WILL KNOW THAT AS A RESULT OF YOUR NEW RULE TO NOT ALLOW ME A DISABLED INMATE WHO NEEDS CRUTCHES TO WALK AROUND. MY OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD, LIKE YOU ALLOW EVERY OTHER INMATE IN THIS INSTITUTION IS NOT ONLY AN 8TH & 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VIOLATION, BUT IS PREJUDICIAL TO INMATES

with disability. I ask you to please allow me to go to the out of cell exercise period with my unit and gallery. It will help me abt. to strengthen my leg and hip. to it's healthier COMPASATE so in time I won't need this crutch to move around from place to place.

By you taking my yard time, I'll only get weaker and helpless and need my crutch even more so now. then ever. I pray WARDEN EDWARDS you decide to change this rule of no yard for those with crutches.

MR. GERALD REED

Thank you.

C.C. WARDEN EDWARDS

DEAR WARDEN HARDY

9/7/10

I'm writing you, BECAUSE I HAVEN'T HEARD FROM EITHER ONE OF THE WARDENS THAT I WROTE ON 8/25/10. I'VE WRITTEN ALL THREE OF YOU TO LET YOU KNOW THAT WHAT YOU'RE DOING IS DISCRIMINATING TOWARDS ME AND OTHER INMATES THAT HAVE DISABILITIES, WHICH REQUIRE US TO WALK WITH CRUTCHES.

WE'RE NOT BEING ALLOWED TO GO OUTSIDE EXERCISE, PROTECTIVE CUSTODY, THE INMATES IN THE HOSPITAL AND ALL THE INMATES IN POPULATION, BUT BECAUSE I USE CRUTCHES TO WALK AROUND, I'M BEING KEPT OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD. THAT'S DISCRIMINATION AND A DIRECT AND DELIBERATE VIOLATION OF THE DISABILITIES ACT. COULD YOU SEND ME THE NAME OF THE DISABILITY ADMINISTRATOR?

I'M GOING TO SEND THE ADA ADMINISTRATOR A LETTER AS WELL, BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, SO I WANT TO NOTIFY THEM SO THEY CAN LOOK INTO MY CLAIM. I PRAY YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THE RULE OF NO WALK FOR ME, CAUSE I HAVE CRUTCHES....

Sincerely/ MR. GERARD REED M-32920

C.C. WARDEN HARDY

WARDEN EDWARDS

9/02/10

I'm writing you. Because I haven't heard from either you or the other two wardens that I wrote on 8/25/10. I've written all three of you to let you know that what you're doing is DISCRIMINATING TOWARDS ME AND OTHER INMATES THAT HAVE DISABILITIES, which require us to walk with crutches.

We're not being allowed to go outside exercise, protective custody, the inmates in the hospital, the men in segregation, AND all the inmates in population out because I use a crutch to walk with to get around.

I'm being denied an out of cell exercise period that's discrimination AND a direct AND deliberate violation of the Disability Act. Could you send me the name of the Disability Administrator?

I'm going to send the ADA Administrator a letter as well, because I believe that this is a violation of the American with Disabilities Act.

So I want to notify them so they can look into my claims. I pray you decide to change the rule of no yard for me, cause I have crutches.

MR GERARD REED

C.O. WARDEN EDWARDS

WARDEN PETER

9/2/10

I'm writing you WARDEN PETER,
BECAUSE I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING FROM YOU
OR THE WARDEN OF PROGRAM EDWARDS FOR NARCO.
WHICH I WROTE ALL THREE OF YOU ON 8/25/10. I'VE
WRITTEN YOU AND THEM, TO LET YOU KNOW THAT WHAT YOU'RE
DOING IS DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS ME AND OTHER INMATES
THAT HAVE DISABILITIES, WHICH REQUIRE US TO WALK WITH
CRUTCHES. WE'RE NOT BEING ALLOWED TO GO TO OUTSIDE
EXERCISE, PROTECTIVE CUSTODY, SEC, THE INMATES IN
THE HOSPITAL AND ALL THE INMATES IN POPULATION, BUT
BECAUSE I USE CRUTCHES TO WALK AROUND WITH, I'M BEING
DENIED AN OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD. THAT'S DIS-
CRIMINATION AND A DIRECT WITH DELIBERATE VIOLATION
OF THE DISABILITIES ACT.

COULD YOU SEND ME THE NAME OF THE DISABILITY
ADMINISTRATOR? I'M GOING TO SEND THE ADA ADMIN-
ISTRATOR A LETTER AS WELL, BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT THIS
IS A VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT.
SO I WANT TO NOTIFY THEM SO THEY CAN LOOK INTO MY
CLAIMS. I PRAY YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THE RULE OF NO
WALK FOR ME, CAUSE I HAVE CRUTCHES...

Sincerely MR. GERALD REED

TO: THE ADA DISABILITY ADMINISTRATOR
SUPERINTENDENT MRS. POMAVICH

9/7/10

I've written grievances on 8/25/10, 9/3/10
AND 9/7/10 CONCERNING MY OUT OF CELL EXERCISE YARD
PERIOD BEING TAKEN FROM ME, BECAUSE I HAVE A
DISABILITY THAT REQUIRES ME TO USE CRUTCHES TO GET
AROUND. EVERY INMATE IN STATEVILLE C.C. SEGREGA-
TION, P.C., HOSPITAL AND POPULATION ALIKE ARE ENTITLED
TO RECEIVE OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, AND THEY GET IT.

WITH THE EXCEPTION BEING ME AND OTHER INMATES
WITH CRUTCHES. IF ONE GROUP OF INMATES ARE BEING
TREATED DIFFERENT FROM ALL THE OTHER INMATES, BE-
CAUSE THEY HAVE CRUTCHES, THAT'S CLEARLY DISCRIMINATION
TOWARDS THAT GROUP. BECAUSE OF THEIR DISABILITY,

I AM ASKING YOU TO PLEASE LOOK INTO THE RULES
THAT PREVENTS ME FROM GOING TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE
BECAUSE I HAVE CRUTCHES....

MR. GERALD REED D-337

DEAR Supt Ponavich - ADA ADMINISTRATOR

10/12/10

Nello.

I've written GRIEVANCES on 9/28/10 AND 10/10/10, ABOUT MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BEING VIOLATED BY ME NOT BEING ABLE TO GO TO THE OUT OF CELL EXERCISE WITH MY CHURCHES. I'm BEING TOLD THAT I CAN ONLY GO OUTSIDE EXERCISE ON SUNDAYS WHICH IS DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS ME AND OTHERS INMATES WITH CHURCHES. I AM A CHRISTIAN AND CHRISTIAN SERVICES ARE ONLY HELD ON SUNDAYS, AND SUNDAYS ONLY. I HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GOING TO CHRISTIAN SERVICES (Church) ON SUNDAYS AND GOING OUT TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE. I SHOULDN'T HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THE TWO THINGS THAT I HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT ~~to~~ \Rightarrow TO RETRIEVE. EVERY INMATE THAT'S IN POPULATION HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRACTICE THEIR RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE, BUT NOT ME, BECAUSE I HAVE TO MAKE A CHOICE OF EITHER GOING TO Church OR TO THE YARD. EVERY RELIGION HAS THEIR WORSHIP SERVICES HELD ON A DAY THAT DOESN'T INTERFERE WITH THEIR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE PERIOD, EXCEPT FOR ME AND OTHER INMATES WITH CHURCHES. MY DAY FOR WORSHIP SERVICE IS SUNDAYS, THE SAME DAY AS I'VE REGULATED TO GO TO OUT OF CELL EXERCISE. THAT'S NOT FAIR. IT'S DISCRIMINATION. ALL POPULATION INMATES P.C. HOSPITAL CONFIDENTIAL INMATES GO OUT TWO TIMES A

WEEK FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, BUT NOT ME OR OTHER INMATES WITH CHUTCHES, WE'RE ONLY ALLOWED OUT ONE TIME A WEEK. THAT IS DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS ME AND INMATES WITH CHUTCHES IN VIOLATION OF THE DISABILITY ACT. MY GRIEVANCES HAVE BEEN SEEN BY THE COUNSULORS AND NOT BY YOU THE ADMINISTRATOR A.D.A. WHICH ALL DISABILITY GRIEVANCES ARE SUPPOSE TO BE REVIEWED BY. I'M SENDING YOU THIS SECOND LETTER ALONG WITH A COPY OF MY GRIEVANCES SO YOU CAN SEE HOW I'VE BEEN DISCRIMINATED AGAINST, BECAUSE OF MY DISABILITY. GRIEVANCES DATED 8/25/10 9/3/10, 9/7/10, 9/9/10, 9/28/10. AND 10/10/10. ARE BEING SENT WITH THIS LETTER. PLEASE LOOK THEM OVER AND LET ME KNOW THAT THESE ACTS OF DISCRIMINATION WILL BE STOPPED...

MR. GERAID REED

THANK YOU. AND
GOD BLESS

WARDEN HARDY

10/12/10

I AM WRITING AGAIN, BECAUSE I AM BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST. MY YARD HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM ME, BECAUSE I HAVE A DISABILITY THAT REQUIRES ME TO USE A CRUTCH TO WALK. EVERY INMATE IN STATEVILLE, BESIDE MYSELF AND OTHER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES ARE GIVEN THEIR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE TIME. THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON ALL SUMMER IT SEEMS LIKE, I WASN'T ALLOWED TO GO TO NIGHT YARD LIKE EVERY BODY IN POPULATION.

THIS IS A DELIBERATE ACT OF DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS INMATES LIKE ME WITH CRUTCHES FOR NO REASON OTHER THAN, BECAUSE YOU CAN DO IT. I HAVEN'T DONE ANYTHING TO LOSE MY RIGHT FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, BUT IT DIDN'T STOP YOU FROM TAKING IT FROM ME AND ONLY ME AND OTHER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES. THAT'S DISCRIMINATION. I'VE WRITTEN ALL 3 WARDENS ON 8/25/10, 9/1/10 AND NOW 10/12/10. HERE I AM AGAIN ASKING FOR AN EXPLANATION WHY MY YARD HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM ME AND WHEN WILL I GET IT BACK? "I PRAY YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THE RULE OF NO YARD FOR INMATES WITH CRUTCHES CAUSE ITS A VIOLATION OF MY 8TH, 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT..."

Sincerely, MR. GERALD REED N-32920

C.C. WARDEN HARDY.

WARDEN PFISTER

10/12/10

I AM WRITING AGAIN, BECAUSE I AM BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST. MY WALK HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM ME. DUE TO I HAVE A DISABILITY THAT REQUIRES ME TO USE A CRUTCH TO GET AROUND.

EVERY INMATE HERE IN THIS FACILITY BESIDE ME AND OTHER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES ARE GIVEN THEIRS OUT OF CELL EXERCISE TIME, THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON ALL SUMMER LONG, IT SEEMS LIKE. I WASN'T ALLOWED TO GO TO NIGHT WALK LIKE EVERYBODY IN POPULATION, UNLESS I LEAVE MY CRUTCH IN. WHICH I NEED TO WALK AROUND.

THIS IS A DELIBERATE ACT OF DISCRIMINATION TOWARDS INMATES LIKE ME WITH CRUTCHES FOR NO REASON OTHER THAN, BECAUSE YOU CAN DO IT. I HAVEN'T DONE ANYTHING TO LOSE MY RIGHT FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE, BUT IT DIDN'T STOP YOU FROM TAKING IT FROM ME AND ONLY ME AND OTHER INMATES WITH CRUTCHES. THAT RIGHT OUT DISCRIMINATION. IVE WRITTEN ALL 3 WARDENS ON 5/25/10, 9/1/10, AND ALSO 10/12/10. NOW, I AM AGAIN ASKING FOR AN EXPLANATION AS TO WHY MY WALK HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM ME. AND WHEN WILL I GET IT BACK? I PRAY THAT YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THE RULE OF NO WALK FOR INMATES WITH CRUTCHES, CAUSE ITS A VIOLATION OF MY 8TH & 14TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT AND THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT.

MR. GERARD REED

WARDEN EDWARDS

10/12/10

I'm writing once again, BECAUSE I AM
being DISCRIMINATED AGAINST, MY YARD HAS BEEN TAKEN
FROM ME, BECAUSE I HAVE A DISABILITY THAT REQUIRES
ME TO USE A CRUTCH TO GET AROUND. EVERY INMATE AT
STATEVILLE BESIDE ME AND OTHER INMATE WITH CRUTCHES
ARE GIVEN THEIR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE TIME. THIS HAS
BEEN GOING ALL SUMMER, ~~IT~~ SEEMS LIKE, I WASN'T ALLOWED
TO GO TO THE NIGHT YARD LIKE EVERYBODY IN POPULATION

THIS IS A DELIBERATE ACT OF DISCRIMINATION
TOWARDS INMATES LIKE ME WITH CRUTCHES FOR NO REASON
WHAT SO EVER, OTHER THAN, BECAUSE YOU CAN. I HAVEN'T
DONE ANYTHING AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION RULE, TO
LOSE MY RIGHT FOR OUT OF CELL EXERCISE. BUT IT DIDN'T
STOP YOU FROM TAKING IT FROM ME AND ALL MY AND OTHER
INMATES WITH CRUTCHES. THAT'S DISCRIMINATION. I'VE
WRITTEN YOU AND THE OTHER TWO WARDENS ON 8/25/10, 9/7/10
AND NOW 10/12/10. WHERE I AM AGAIN ASKING FOR AN EX-
PLANATION AS TO WHY MY YARD HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM ME
AND WHEN WILL I GET IT BACK? I PRAY YOU DECIDE TO
CHANGE THE RULE OF NO YARD FOR INMATES WITH CRUTCHES
BECAUSE IT'S A VIOLATION OF MY 8TH & 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS AND THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT...

MR. GERALD REED

Thank you!

COPY

DATE: April 6, 2011

TO: Gladys C. Taylor, Acting Director
Illinois Department of Corrections
1301 Concordia Court
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9277

FROM: Amanda Shackelford
6543 South Ingleside
Chicago, Illinois 60637

In re: Lack of meaningful medical care toward my son's condition.

SENT VIA CERTIFIED MAIL: 7010 1670 0001 1409 2867

My son is Gerald Reed, register number **N32920**, and he is currently within your custody and confined at the Stateville Correctional Center. Since you are legally responsible for the care, custody and control of my son, I deem it necessary and imperative to contact you for purpose of apprising you as to my son's medical situation.

Prior to my son's incarceration he suffered a gunshot wound to his right leg which necessitated surgery culminating in a pin being inserted in his leg. When my son was arrested for the offense underlying his present incarceration, he was physically abused by the police which resulted in further injury to his leg.

Now that my son has gotten older the leg is giving him problems and he's being experiencing tremendous pain and suffering. The pin in his right leg has begun to penetrate the muscle in the leg having the concomitant effect of causing ongoing physical pain. The medical staff at the Stateville Correctional Center is doing nothing of

significance to address the medical needs of my son whereas the problem with his leg is corrected. Instead, my son is essentially given Tylenol or some similar medication to alleviate the pain, but this is not a medical remedial measure. Although, I am not a physician, but I surmise that my son need to have some sort of corrective surgery to permanently address his medical problem. The current medical attention provided to my son for his condition is medically insufficient and bordering on deliberate indifference when the magnitude of the problem is objectively considered.

On behalf of my son, I am imploring you to promptly take necessary action to intervene, as head of the Department of Corrections, to get my son the medical treatment that his medical condition warrant to bring about a permanent solution. In this vein, the pain and suffering that my son endures will remedied.

Thank you, for your much needed assistance. I pray that you will help my son get the medical treatment that he so desperately need. I am respectfully requesting a responsive letter from you addressing the subject matter of this correspondence

Sincerely,

Amanda Shackelford

Copy:

File

Gerald Reed

Marcus Hardy, Warden

Medical Director, IDOC

Joseph Rose, IDOC legal Services